DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 435 433 PS 027 295

AUTHOR	Martin, Suzanne; Lyons, Sandy; Taylor-Sterling, Lora
TITLE	Building Relationships in a Small Group Setting.
PUB DATE	1998-12-17
NOTE	36p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Antisocial Behavior; *Interpersonal Competence; Kindergarten; *Kindergarten Children; *Peer Acceptance; *Peer Relationship; Pretests Posttests; Primary Education; Rejection (Psychology); Sociometric Techniques; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS	Playgroups

ABSTRACT

Based on the view that positive peer relationships help children function successfully at school, this study examined how teachers can help rejected, aggressive, or controversial children build social skills in a small group setting. Participating were three kindergarten students at a rural Alaskan elementary school, selected because they experienced considerable social failure from the first day of kindergarten. The students participated individually in after-school playgroups where they played one-on-one with one teacher for an hour each week. After a few weeks, selected peers were brought into the groups to act as models. Each teacher maintained a journal noting incidents of social disturbances and conflicts, contacts made with parents and the school administration, and the student's use of socially appropriate interaction. Some playgroup sessions were videotaped to assist in identifying and analyzing problems and successes of students in interacting with others. A pre- and post-intervention sociogram was administered privately and individually to each student in the kindergarten classrooms to see how frequently targeted children were selected as playmates and to see where they each fit socially in the classroom. The three teachers met at least three times weekly to discuss problems and solutions. Data indicated that during the weeks that the play groups were held, the targeted children showed more successful entry into play in the classroom and greater willingness to join the group or participate in problem-solving with others. However, antisocial behavior continued to be displayed, although it was less frequent and less severe. (Sociogram information is appended. Contains 26 references.) (KB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 435 433

Building Relationships in a Small Group Setting

by
Suzanne Martin, Sandy Lyons & Lora Taylor-Sterling

For:
ED 610 Guidance and Discipline for Young Children

December 17, 1998

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Lora L. T. Sterling
Suzanne Martin
Sandra M. Lyons
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

PS 027295

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract——1
Introduction——2
Review of the Literature
I. The Importance of Developing Relationships——3
II. Anti-Social Behavior——5
III. Strategies for Helping Rejected or Controversial Children-7
Methodology——11
Subject #1. ——13
Subject #2. ——16
Subject #3. ——19
Results——23
Professional Readings——24
Appendix
A-1 Pre-Sociogram Classroom 1
A-2 Pre-Sociogram Classroom 2
B-1 Post-Sociogram Classroom 1
B-2 Post-Sociogram Classroom 2

Abstract

Studies show that children must build relationships in order to function successfully both socially and academically at school. This paper examines how teachers can help rejected, aggressive or controversial children build social skills in a small group setting. The three of us set up an after school playgroup for each of 3 children and interacted one-on-one with them. After a few weeks, selected peers were brought into the groups to act as models for these children. During the weeks that playgroup was held we noticed changes in the children during the school day such as more successful entry into play, a willingness to join the group and participate in the problem-solving process. However, we continue to see anti-social behavior displayed by our case subjects although it is usually less frequent and less severe.

Introduction

At the beginning of this school year we, (the authors of this study), discovered that there were many children entering kindergarten with extreme antisocial behaviors. We noticed that many children were solving conflict through the use of aggression. Some children seemed to have great difficulty interacting with their peers during choice time, recess and other parts of the day. As a result of this lack of social skills, some children experienced rejection while others were controversial, having peers to play with on one hand but causing problems for other children and adults on the other.

Despite our best efforts as constructivist teachers, we became increasingly frustrated as the beginning weeks of school went on with little change in these children. We realized that for the sake of our classroom community we would have to develop strategies to help these children interact in more socially acceptable ways.

We have noticed in the past five years that more and more children are coming to school ill-prepared for the social interactions that are so crucial not only to their academic success but to the total well-being of each kindergarten student. How can we help? This desire to help our current students as well as those we will have in the future has led to the formation of our question:

What happens when we build a relationship in a small group setting?

This paper will present findings to support our belief that modeling appropriate social skills and building relationships in a small group setting are key components to positive social interactions.

Review of the Literature

I. The Importance of Developing Relationships

According to DeVries & Zan, (1994), social relationships influence every aspect of a child's development. It is the context in which children construct their ideas and feelings about themselves, the world of people, and the world of objects. Depending on the quality of the social relationships in a child's life, he or she learns in what ways the world of people is safe or unsafe. The child learns to think of him or herself as having certain characteristics in relation to others.

Many people influence a child's social development. Each relationship plays an important part in the development of the whole child. These influences include the family, peers and the teacher's role.

The influence of the family

Parents' positive relationships with their children are an important prerequisite to building positive relationships throughout life. "Children are most likely to be secure, confident, and socially competent if their parents are warm and attentive and also help them understand limits" (Fields & Boesser, 1998, p. 51). Parents have an opportunity to be their child's play partner. When parents play with a child, they subtly teach them through imitation or identification, many prosocial behaviors such as turn-taking, sharing, and solving conflicts without aggression that will help the child in future relationships. "It seems then that the co-playing relationship between parents and children may be an important way that parents prepare their children for school and the world of peers" (Scarlett, 1986, p. 88).

One study (Kemple, 1991) showed that children who have a secure attachment relationship as babies were more likely to be accepted by their peers in preschool. On the other hand children who have experienced an insecure relationship were more likely to approach new peer friendships with ambivalence and with expectations of rejection. Another study (Scarlett, 1991) found that parents of children that did not interact with others at nursery school were far less likely to play with their children than were parents of interacting preschoolers

The most natural setting for building relationships is in the context of the home and family. Parents and extended family members have the opportunity to model and teach appropriate behaviors for social interactions with others.

The influence of peers

Although one of the most important influences on children's social development is the family, in recent years the important role that peers play in social development as children move out of infancy and toddlerhood has become more apparent (Katz & McClellan, 1997). Due to an increase in day care and preschools, children at younger and younger ages are spending a greater proportion of time with peers. The quality of these peer experiences may have a greater impact on children's development than ever before.

(Ramsey, 1991). Although the research shows that many children are spending more time with peers due to the influences of daycare and preschool, the majority of kindergarten students at Sterling Elementary have not attended daycare or preschool.

The influence of peers plays a crucial role in the social development of children and may provide the only opportunity for a child to develop appropriate and positive relationships.

The results of research by Freud and Dann indicate that, "when young children are unable to develop adequate attachments to adults, for whatever reason, an emotional vacuum is created that my be filled by relationships with peers" (Katz & McClellan, p. 19).

Although the majority of the first years of life have been dominated by adult relationships, the importance of peer relationships cannot be underestimated. "Peer relationships have special qualities that are not likely to exist in adult-child relationships and that may contribute in important ways to the child's social development" (Kemple, 1991, p. 48). Peers have a greater influence on each other's social development than was once acknowledged, "Children are more likely to imitate the prosocial responses of peer models, live or televised" (Eisenberg & Mussen, 1989, p. 96).

Although adults can have a tremendous impact on children's social development, it is important that they also let children interact with each other without adult influence. According to Piaget, it is crucial for children to have many opportunities to challenge each other's thinking and learn the ropes of social interaction from one another (Katz & & McClellan, p. 38). In our kindergarten classrooms we provide many opportunities throughout the day for peer social interactions including choice time, snack math, group games, community time and cooperative activities.

The importance of positive peer relationships can affect children in many areas of their life. "Both observations and self-reports attest to the importance of friendships, not only to children's immediate enjoyment of school and recreational activities but also to many aspects of their physical, cognitive, emotional and social development" (Ramsey, 1991, p. 2). We have noticed that friendships between our students seem to help them feel more secure in the classroom setting. Furthermore, the impact of good friendships may have a long-term effect on drop-out and delinquency rates" (p. 4). All in all, "adequate social interaction may play a vital role in the future well-being of the child" (McClellan, 1989, p.10).

When children are involved in positive peer relationships they become better prepared not only to interact in the world of the school but to live in the larger social world. Positive relationships can help children develop a greater awareness for others and help develop skills in learning how to relate to a broader range of people (Ramsey, 1991).

The teacher's role

The teacher can play a vital role in helping young children develop prosocial strategies. As children learn to interact with each other, she can "act as a coach, providing

encouragement, critiquing the performance and recommending strategies for improvement" (Fields & Boesser, 1998, p. 55).

Modeling prosocial behavior is the most basic element for enhancing student socialization. Teachers must set an example for their students by explicitly modeling behaviors such as listening to others, understanding others feelings and . As teachers of young children, we strongly believe in the importance of taking the time to model appropriate social behaviors to our students. Therefore we find that we must spend our day with the students modeling behaviors we would like to see them adapt. Brophy (1996) confirms our practice by stating that, "Modeling accompanied by verbalization of the self-talk that guides prosocial behavior, can be a very influential method of student socialization because it conveys the thinking and decision-making involved in acting for the common good" (p. 105).

Our job to help children build important relationships may sometimes seem over-whelming but we must never underestimate the importance of these relationships in the lives of our students. We must keep in mind as we work with children that, "The main goal of social development is to help children find their own ways to interact comfortably with peers and to feel good about themselves while they are doing it" (Ramsey, 1991, p. 9).

II. Anti-Social Behavior

Children who do not establish positive peer relationships in early childhood may be at risk as adolescents and adults. Not only might they have emotional and mental health problems but they may be more at risk for dropping out of school and delinquency (Kemple, 1991). Studies show there are also later job & marital problems along with stress and lowered-self-esteem (Ramsey, 1991).

Peer rejection can be devastating to a child. "If a child is rejected by her peers or is in some way thwarted in learning the social ropes from peers, a crucial source of social information is lost (Katz & McClellan, 1997, p. 17).

Rejected Children:

A rejected child is one who has difficulty interacting with other children and is not well liked by them according to sociometric measures (Hazen, 1982, Ramsey, 1991, Asher & Coie, 1990). In one study, children who were rejected by their peers after the first 2 months of the school year were found to develop less favorable perceptions of school, higher levels of school avoidance, and lower levels of school performance over the course of their kindergarten year" (Kemple, 1991, p. 48). These children cannot make the distinction between appropriate and inappropriate times to socialize. They make more "overtures" to peers during class time than during recess (Ramsey, 1991). Rabiner and Coie reasoned that it's not always that they do not know how to behave in socially skilled ways, but that they expect to be disliked and that such expectations prevent them from using the skills they actually have in their repertoires (Katz & McClellan, 1989).

When rejected children try to enter the play of their peers some of their entry strategies are overly tentative or too intrusive. These students may
*make comments about self
*make a feeling comment "I'm mad at Robert"
*disagree with what host children are doing
*ask a question unrelated to the ongoing activity (Ramsey, 1991; Putallaz & Gottman, 1981).

Rejected children may also exhibit anti-social behaviors that contribute to difficulty socializing with their peers in positive ways. These behaviors include physical aggression, bullying/bossing and lying. The case studies we are presenting in this paper discuss children who have exhibited these behaviors that have resulted in them having difficulty building relationships with others. We define these three anti-social behaviors in the following paragraphs.

The use of aggression can lead to peer rejection. There are several forms of aggression that can be exhibited by young children. Aggressive actions can be:

(a) accidental actions, in which there is no intentionality. For example, one of our case subjects who seems to have a problem with gross-motor control, often bumps into other children unintentionally causing harm.

(b) instrumental actions, in which the child deliberately employs aggression in pursuit of a goal. Another case subject painted a peer's arm in order to get her to move.

(c) hostile actions, in which the child acts to cause harm to another person (Jewett, 1992)). One of our subjects intentionally bashed his body into 5 or 6 other students in the line almost knocking them down.

Aggressive behavior is a deterrent to friendships and social success. Young children cite aggressive behavior as a significant reason for disliking others. (Jewett, 1992). Children who act aggressively toward others are often the least liked in the classroom (Bullock, 1992). Our data from the sociometric measure (See appendicies) indicated that our subjects are the least or nearly the least classmates chosen for a playmate. Cooperation and aggression have been found to forecast whether preschool children become liked or disliked by classmates as the school year progresses. Kemple (1991) reported that in a study of children's playground behaviors over the course of one school year, Ladd, Price and Hart found that children who engaged in higher levels of cooperative play at the beginning of the school year became more accepted by the end of the school year. Children who engaged in arguing and aggressive behavior became more rejected by the end of the school year.

Some aggressive children are completely rejected while others, controversial in status, are only sometimes rejected. Some children may be unpleasant to be with and not very trustworthy, but these controversial children may have positive social attributes that compensate for their aversive behavior. They may influence other children in acceptable ways or may facilitate the goals of others by being helpful and cooperative at times thus they might not be rejected even though they are highly aggressive (Coie et al, 1985, p 374). The child in our study who appears to fit the description of a controversial child

displays many socially appropriate behaviors and has peers to play with most of the time. However, this same child often uses aggression, making others cry and/or feel angry.

Bullies are children that make others do things against their will or prevent them from exercising their own will (Katz & McClellan, 1997). Bullies tend to pick certain children as targets, often referred to as 'victims'. Some victims are also aggressive and provoke attacks, but others are targets because they submit too easily and will not stand up for themselves (Ramsey). "Children who are bossy and domineering will not be fun to be with or will not influence others in acceptable ways" (Asher & Coie, 1990, p. 374). Other students often comment about our subjects that display bully/bossy behaviors saying things such as "I don't want to play with him, he bosses me" or "He makes me mad". Boys are usually described as bullies while girls are bossy (Katz & McCellan p. 95). From our case study we have found that children can have characteristics of both.

Children who are afraid of being punished are more likely to lie about an incident or their involvement in an incident (Fields & Boesser, 1998). Lies are used in a child's relations with others to meet needs for company, to belong, to be accepted and to have status with peers. The need to lie shares importance with all other drives and needs. The child's perception of peer acceptance may cause the child to feel the need to fabricate the facts about him/herself. Children lie to maintain their self-esteem and to protect and assert the ideas and attitudes they have formed regarding themselves. Children frequently lie to cover up their deficiencies (Warrren, 1976). In our case study we have observed that excessive lying can interfere with the building of friendships. Students have become increasingly frustrated with our case subjects that constantly lie.

Long-Term Effects

Children with antisocial behaviors not only pay the price immediately by being rejected by their peers but they continue to pay the price as a consequence of the reputation that follows them. "Once a child has established a reputation among peers either as someone with whom it is fun to play or as someone with whom joint play is unpleasant or dissatisfying, this reputation may influence the way other children perceive the child's later behavior" (Kemple, 1991, p 2).

III. Strategies for Helping Rejected or Controversial Children

What children must learn to have successful peer relationships

Learning social skills is a crucial part of the curriculum for young children. "If educators recognize that compassion and learning how to establish relationships are among the most important things anyone can learn, they will spend time in the classroom assisting the development of such social skills" (Fields, 1998, p. 121).

Building peer relationships do not always come easy or naturally to many children. There are many skills and strategies that children need to develop to fully participate in their social environment. Some of these skills include:

1. Gain entrance into peer groups and initiate interactions with individuals
2. Resolve conflict
3. Manage aggression

4. Elaborate on the theme play
5. Be willing to give as well as take
6. Exchange, adjust or embellish the roles in games and dramatic play (Ramsey, 1991, p. 6).

There has been much research done about how teachers can help rejected or controversial children develop these necessary skills to interact positively with their peers.

Assessing social competence

Because social competence plays such an important role in the future success of the child both in school and out of school, teachers need to take the time to assess students' skills. Standardized and other paper and pencil tests are not appropriate means of doing this. "It is only through careful and methodical observation of a child's interaction in actual social situations that the teacher can gain insight into which behaviors are contributing to the child's problem" (Hazen, 1982, p. 14). When observing students in authentic interactions, Pelligrini & Glickman (1990) state that many kinds of assessment are needed to get an accurate picture of a child's peer relationships. Some of the most common assessments include observational data and peer nomination measures. During our project we found that recording observations of our case studies' interactions and individually interviewing our kindergartners gave us a rich source of useful information. This information helped us discover patterns of anti-social behavior and to track growth in social development.

The benefits of small group interaction

There have been some studies done on the effects of social skills training for an entire classroom. (Choi & Hekenlaible-Gotto, 1997). Although these studies have resulted in an increase of scores on sociometric measures, some studies suggest that working with small groups of children may be the most effective way to enhance socialization skills and build relationships (Hazen, 1982; Eisenberg & Musseng, 1989; Stimson, 1988, emple, 1991; Ferrintino, 1990).

Through our experience working with a small group of children (1-4 students) we have found it easier and more effective to give guidance on an individual basis. Katz & McClellan (1997) support this by stating, "Whole-group instruction is not well suited to the way young children learn best. What works well with young children is individual guidance" (p. 20). Individual guidance is more effective than whole group because the child is:

1. More likely to pay attention and engage in constructing a new understanding when she is directly involved in a situation.
2. Easier for the teacher to offer the child suggestions in a warm and supportive context when he does so individually.

(Katz & McClellan, 1997).

Modeling/Co-playing/Coaching

Because we are noticing more and more children enter school without the social skills needed to interact with peers successfully, we feel a need for explicit modeling and coaching of social skills. "Teachers can demonstrate social skills by explicitly modeling socially appropriate behaviors such as sharing, initiating positive conversations, and helping others (Buzzelli & File, 1989, p. 73).

Social skills can be taught in authentic situations as children need it, and teachers can coach children on which behaviors may be helpful in specific situations (Buzzelli & File, 1989). Kindergarten teachers provide an abundance of opportunities for children's interactions among peers. This allows teachers to focus more specifically on children having difficulties with the development of social skills and provide ongoing coaching in the classroom. "The most effective social skills training may be the spontaneous coaching and modeling that [kindergarten] teachers do almost continuously" (Ramsey, 1991, p. 144).

Studies have been done on coaching effective strategies for peer socialization. One such study showed that the "coaching procedure was effective in increasing isolated children's peer acceptance. Children who were coached received higher ratings from the children they interacted with in the play sessions and also from non-partners" (Oden & Asher, 1977, p. 504). However, the social skills training was done on a one on one basis and the children were able to practice these skills in a small group setting with only one other peer. Follow-up studies showed a year later that the children in the study had moved to even greater inclusion than before. We hope to have similar results with our case subjects as a result of our one-on-one play group sessions.

Another part of coaching is helping students to reflect how their behaviors affect others. Many children cannot make this connection without assistance. Helping the child recognize when successful behaviors work and when unsuccessful ones don't, reinforces positive behaviors and helps a child develop alternative ones. (Buzzelli & File, 1989).

An effective way for teachers to model appropriate social behaviors is to engage in co-play with the student. Co-play happens when the teacher becomes the child's play partner (Wolf, 1986). To be effective, several factors must be in place. These include:

- *The teacher must give up traditional ways of relating to a child and play with a child as a peer would play.
- *The teacher must find ways to be a satisfying play partner. In the beginning this means following the child's lead.
- *Gradually, the teacher should play in ways that bring out the prosocial behaviors the child needs to develop.
- *The teacher must build a strong enough relationship with the child to know when to allow a peer to join in (Wolf, 1986).

Having playgroup once a week gave us several opportunities to act as a play partner with our students. Some of the activities we engaged in during co-play included, woodworking, painting, playing board and card games and dramatic play.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Positive expectations

There is reason to believe that children tend to adjust their behavior to fit the definitions of those who are significant to them. In other words, the attributions adults make about children's characters tend to be adopted by the children, becoming self-images that they, in turn, try to live up (or down) to (Katz & McClellan, 1989).

The following are some of the techniques we adopted to help our subjects reflect positive expectations:

*Maintain clear and realistic goals for the child. Think in terms of a 'threshold' of acceptance not popularity. Try to interrupt the cycle of rejection enough to stop the actively negative interactions

*Convey a positive attitude toward the child. (Ramsey, 1991).

*Treat students as if they are well-intentioned individuals

*Reinforce prosocial behaviors through expressions of appreciation (Brophy, 1996)

Authoritative teaching

Young children can benefit from the understanding support and guidance of the adults who help them develop constructive strategies for dealing with the challenges of early peer relationships (Kemple, 1992).

Teachers, as the authority figure in the classroom, need to be authoritative rather than authoritarian or permissive. Teachers have the right and the responsibility to exert leadership and to exercise control. But they increase their chances of success if they are understanding and supportive of students and if they make sure that students understand the reasons behind their demands. Some principles for handling situations involving conflict constructively include:

*Minimize power struggles and face-saving gestures by discussing the incident in private

*Question the student to determine his or her awareness of the behavior and explanation for it.

*Make sure that the student understands why the behavior is inappropriate and cannot be tolerated.

*Seek to get the student to accept responsibility for the behavior and to make a commitment to change.

*Provide any needed modeling or instruction in better ways of coping.

*Work with the student to develop a mutually agreeable plan for solving a problem.

*Concentrate on developing self-regulation capacities through positive socialization and instruction.

While in the process of this research, our awareness of the constructivist principles has been heightened. Therefore we have made extra efforts to put these principles into practice during our playgroup as well as the regular school day.

Using constructivist strategies (like those mentioned above) will lead to genuine solutions for chronic behavioral problems. Although social praise or tangible rewards have been used in many studies to increase the frequency of peer interactions, once the rewards have been eliminated, the child returns to previous anti-social behaviors (Oden & Asher, 1977). For this reason we do not use tangible rewards in the playgroup or in our kindergarten classrooms.

It may take much longer to help a child develop appropriate prosocial skills using constructive techniques. "When children understand their own behavior as instrumental in meeting their needs and influencing how peers behave toward them, they possess valuable knowledge that develops and sustains their trust in themselves" (Buzzelli & Fjle, 1989).

Family Involvement

Sometimes our best efforts to help rejected, aggressive or controversial children are not enough without additional support. Communicating with parents will be especially important for teachers working with children who have difficulty interacting with peers (Bullock, 1992). It stands to reason, then, that involving parents may be vital in the continuation of social skill development. We cannot neglect the importance of what parents can do to help their children become socially adept. Ramsey (1991) suggests that parents can help by:

*Keeping a log of their child's behavior and then being involved in analyzing the problem.
*Reporting their child's behavior in other settings.
*Supporting the teacher's efforts
*Extending the child's friendship outside of school
*being a co-player with their child, allowing their child to lead the play.

To assist parents in becoming involved in building their child's positive relationships, there are many things teachers can do. Teachers need to accommodate the parents schedule, including making home visits or scheduling evening or weekend conferences. For example, the half-time teacher arranges to meet with the parents on her day off. For their convenience, we often call parents in the evening. Maintaining contact with family members on an ongoing basis to communicate positive as well as negative interactions, helps build trust between the teacher and the family.

The literature we have reviewed has confirmed our belief that teachers, parents and peers can have a positive influence on a child's social skill development. The research clearly supports the benefits of a small group setting for the intervention of rejected, aggressive or controversial children.

Methodology

Subjects

Demaris, Justin, and Brady are 5-year-old kindergarten students at Sterling Elementary school in Sterling, Alaska. Sterling is a rural bedroom community with a population of approximately 3,000. The socioeconomic status is low due to the seasonal nature of employment opportunities.

Sterling School houses grades K-6 with a population of about 300 students. There are 2 classes per grade. Our subjects of study are enrolled in the kindergarten. We, the authors, are their teachers and tutor. Our kindergartens are regular ed classrooms with an average of 18 students per class.

From the very first day of school, these three students were experiencing a great deal of social failure among their peers. Other students began to complain about hitting, name-calling, lying and bossiness. In addition, we were experiencing a great deal of frustration with these particular students.

Journal entries

Each of us took one of these children to focus on and work with for the purpose of this study. We began by keeping frequent journal entries on our individual subjects. We noted incidents of social disturbances and conflicts with peers and adults. We kept track of each contact made with the parents and/or school administrator. We also noted when the students appeared to use socially appropriate means to interact with others.

Playgroup

With permission from the parents we organized one-hour per week playgroup sessions. We invited Demaris, Brady and Justin to stay after school to play one on one with one of us. At this time we had three separate playgroups in three separate rooms comprised of one adult and one student. The activities were mostly student led so each child's activity was not necessarily the same but occasionally two of the children played together during a playgroup session.

As our research progressed we began to notice that our subjects needed peer interaction to encourage transfer of newly developing social skills. Therefore we invited one or more children to participate in one of the groups. We focused on building and modeling social skills such as turn taking, using words to communicate in positive ways, cooperating on a project and appropriate ways to enter play.

As we continue the playgroup sessions, we often alternate between having peer-play and one-on-one with the teacher as co-player. We invite peers for co-play depending on the skill development or the need of the child.

Videotaping:
We videotaped some of the playgroup sessions to help us identify and analyze the problems and successes our subjects were experiencing as they interacted with others. The videotape also served as a way to give the children instant feedback of their social behaviors and to help them reflect on the skills they used.

Sociograms:
A pre and post Ellis sociogram was administered privately and individually to each student in the kindergarten classrooms (see appendix A & B). The purpose was to see how frequently our case subjects were chosen as playmates and to see where they each fit socially in the classroom based on this sociometric measure. Each student was asked the question, "If you could play with anyone in our class, who would you play with?" Each student selected his or her top 3 choices of playmates for each administration of the sociogram.

Collaboration Sessions:
At least three times a week, we met after school to compare notes on our particular subjects. We discussed problems we were encountering, possible solutions and strategies for encouraging positive social interactions. Our subjects were a constant source of frustration and a great challenge to us, our students, parents of other students and the subjects' parents as well. We found that these sessions gave us a great deal of support and encouragement to continue on with this project to do the best we could for these children.

Data Analysis

The data we collected is specific to each case subject. An analysis of the data will be presented in each subject's individual section of this paper.

Subject # 1 Demaris

Personal Background:
Demaris is a 5 year and 5 month old girl. She lives with her mom and step-dad. Demaris' step-dad is very involved with her. Mom reported that Demaris' birth father lives in the area, but doesn't see her very often. Demaris' mom and step-dad have been very supportive of the playgroup.

Demaris' mom works at a bank in the next town (10 miles away), her step-dad works at an oil field contractors company just 2 miles from the school. Demaris is an only child, however; she has a large extended family that lives in the area. She often speaks of spending time with them. Her aunts pick her up from school on days her mom is working.

School background (before kindergarten): Demaris attended preschool at a large preschool/Decker in the next town. (Our town does not have a preschool.) Her preschool teacher reports that Demaris does very well academically. At the end of preschool, Demaris knew her colors and shapes, most letters, some letter sounds, most numbers, understood quantities to 10 or more, and enjoyed listening to stories, reading the pictures of books, and writing/telling her own stories. Her preschool teacher reported that Demaris' behavior was often antisocial. She said Demaris spent time in time-out everyday and often throughout the day. She reported each day Demaris was at school to be a "catastastrophe" due to Demaris' behavior. The primary discipline technique used was time-out and deprivation of a privilege. It was reported that Demaris' mom was concerned, but that her behaviors never seemed to change.

History of behavior at school:
From the very first day of kindergarten, it was apparent that Demaris was going to need some additional support in behavioral areas. Demaris' was very curious about the materials in the room and all the places to play (Housekeeping area, Puppet theater, art center, computer center, etc...). Although we gave 60 minutes for free exploration and play, when it was time to clean up, Demaris was unhappy and uncooperative. Encouraging her, coaxing her, and even demanding her to participate in clean up and other activities throughout the day were not successful. Demaris seemed to want to direct the play in whatever area she was playing. Commands such as, "I'm the mom and you're the dog," (housekeeping area) or "Make me a cake for my birthday. I want pink candles in it," (sand trough), were common. If she wanted something someone else had she would grab it from them. When asked if she had asked the person, she might say, "Pleeeze?" without looking at the person, and she would sigh and roll her eyes, or put her hand on her hips. When asked to join the group for community time, help clean up after our activities, or line-up for music, gym, or library, Demaris would tell me that she didn't have to, or that I couldn't make her.

Demaris' first school behaviors included non-compliance, defiance, grabbing, pushing, kicking, hitting, running away, and verbal insults to children and adults. These behaviors escalated as the days rolled by. Demaris drew with marker on another students face, she painted the cheek and arm of another, threw sand in someone's face, left the playground

or classroom when she thought it necessary (without permission), and defaced school property.

Demaris' parents were called or spoken to in person, each day. At one point, mom said she just didn't know what to do. The school's intervention team met and discussed options for dealing with the behaviors that Demaris was exhibiting. The team decided that Demaris would have 3 choices when a defiant attitude was exhibited: 1) Participate appropriately in what the class was doing; 2) Go to time-out; or 3) Go to the principals office and then home. In the case of hitting, kicking, or hurting someone in any way she would be sent home directly. These measures seemed very punitive to me but I was at a loss for what to do. However, one suggestion was that of an older person (a teacher, secretary, nurse, custodian, or even an older student) spending time with her modeling appropriate behaviors and discussing problems that had happened. This suggestion struck a cord with me. I decided that I would be the older person and that we would have a 1:1 playgroup on Monday's after school.

Data Analysis:

Journal entries:

As I looked through my journal, I noted that Demaris' behavior was really bothering me and was also hurting or distracting others, as well. As I analyzed the entries, I began to see that the behaviors I was most upset about, hurting others and leaving supervision without permission, were the most rare. I noticed that the defiant and verbal abusive behaviors were the most common. After the Intervention team's meeting, Demaris was told of the 3 Choice Plan. She was not happy about it. I also mentioned the idea of staying after school with me to play. She thought this would be good. She was given the 3 Choice Plan about 5 times. Only once she chose time-out. The other 4 times she chose to do what the group wanted to do. On Oct. 20th, she poured sand in a boy's hair at recess. By this time we had had 3 play sessions. I spoke with her about the incident. I asked her what she thought the boy was feeling. She said sad and mad. I asked what could be done about it. She said she would have to choose one of the 3 choices. The way she said it, very apathetically, really struck me. She really did not understand that her actions had negatively impacted the boy's day. She was just going to choose one of the three things and then it would all be over. I asked if choosing one of the 3 things would help the boy feel better about his day. She said she didn't think so. So I asked what she could do to help. She thought for a moment and said she could help get the sand out, if he would let her. I responded that her plan sounded good to me and that she should ask the boy. At this time I also told her that I knew what kind of friend she was, because she and I had been playing together. I knew that she was very smart and could think of fun things to do. I said I wanted the kids at school to know the same things about her that I do. She went off to help the boy. This was a turning point for me and for Demaris, too, I think. I have not asked her to choose from the 3 Choice Plan again. It really wasn't addressing the problem. As the weeks progressed, the antisocial behavior became less. By Nov. 6th, Demaris was using much less defiant behavior, her aggressive actions were nearly non-existent, and I was noticing more and more appropriate social skills in her play and work. Demaris went to Vermont with her parents and was gone for ten days. As expected, earlier behaviors were being used when she returned, but not nearly as frequently.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Playgroup:
I have met with Demaris in a 1:1 playgroup for one hour per week for the past 8 weeks. Demaris missed one playtime due to chicken pox and two others due to vacation. During the chicken pox I called her and visited for a few minutes. When she has attended the playgroup, we have spent our time engaged in whatever she wants to do. I have made a point to be a reciprocal player. We have cleaned the classroom, built and airplane from wood scraps, painted pictures, read stories, played at the doll house, dug in the sand and made bead necklaces. Until this past week, Demaris and I were the only ones in our playgroup. She began tell other students that she could have a playgroup and no one else could. She said it in a way that made me think that a peer might be what she needed. Last week we invited another classmate to stay and play. I noticed that she didn't really play with the new friend. Their play was parallel, but cooperative. I have continued to be a co-player.

Sociogram:
A sociogram was administered to the class, asking the students to pick who they would most like to play with. I was interested to see that Demaris had a fair number of choices. She was in the high range meaning that she had several other students choose her as their playmate. This surprised me, since so much of her interactions with others seemed to be full of conflict. We administered the same sociogram 39 days later and found that the number of students choosing her for a playmate had decreased. I was again surprised. Demaris had made some great progress toward more socially acceptable ways of working and playing and treating others. I realized later that the sociogram had been given just two days after her return from Vermont. I am thinking this may have impacted the data somewhat. We plan to give the sociogram again in about two months.

Video:
I did not take any video of Demaris and me playing. I have felt that it would be too intrusive at this time.

Summary:
Working and playing with Demaris in a 1:1 playgroup has been very beneficial. I have appreciated her ideas and have been able to see her abilities in ways I couldn't have done in the regular class with 19 other children. Demaris' social skills have been much better in a 1:1 setting, though I wonder how much she uses her skills due to my being the teacher, authority figure, etc.. I did notice that her social skills were becoming more and more appropriate with her peers. I am anticipating that trend will continue. I feel that the time and effort put into this playgroup project has been very beneficial.

Subject # 2 Justin

Personal Background

Justin lives with his mother, stepfather and three siblings. He has two older sisters and a brother that is one grade level higher. His father died when he was just a few months old.

When you visit with the Mother you can tell that the death of Justin's father has had a great impact on the family's life. Justin seems standoffish and isolates himself from others, which is common when a tragedy has affected a life.

The family likes outdoor activities such as snowboarding, dirt bikes, and mud driving (Justin says mud driving is when you drive a four-wheel drive truck in soft mud). Justin's stepfather runs the local go cart track, which has had an influence on his activities. His mother works in the home, which accounts for Justin never being introduced to others his age. Kindergarten is his first experience of interacting with children his own age. This might have something to do with his lack of skills to join in or interact positively.

History of behavior at school

Since the beginning of school Justin has had trouble interacting with his peers in positive ways. He doesn't have the skills needed to join in activities positively. When he does join in activities he uses negative techniques that cause great stress to the other students. Since he is a large child that is use to rough housing with his older siblings this causes his peers to be afraid of him.

When asked to join in by teachers he is likely to be on the outskirts of the activity. Such as group sharing on the floor he will be listening,but outside of the circle of peers. He is slow in joining in the activities.

Also it seems that the mornings start off in a positive matter but as the day progresses Justin becomes more aggressive or non-cooperative in his interactions.

Data Analysis

Journal entries:

In the beginning it was felt that if we built a relationship with Justin that this would help him interact positively with others. Justin and I would spend at least one hour a week playing and doing activities together. This was a great time to visit about our families and friends. Also I could model proper ways of joining into play. A good example of this was when we would be playing a game and I would say please and thank you at the appropriate times.

Also during this time we would help others in the school with chores they would have. The school secretary had us cutting out tardy slips for her. During this time we would visit about how important it is to help others and how our kindness makes others happy.

These were great times and the interaction between myself and Justin was making progress in the right direction. He would come and interact with me in all the positive ways when I was around but the transfer to his peers wasn't apparent. He was still having trouble entering play or work with others in a positive way. Justin was still not joining in-group interaction and when asked he would be illusive in joining.

Playgroup:

At this point we (teachers) were at a stand still when it came to helping Justin become a positive and productive learner. After discussion and research into the matter we decided what was needed was peer interaction during these small group times. Maybe this would help the positive social interactions to transfer where Justin was still struggling. This was where it was decided that the subjects (Justin & Brady) would spend time with each other. Justin and Brady spent time with us and through modeling and interaction with the boys we could see them using the social skills needed to interact in a group positively.

As time progressed we could see that Brady was able to interact with his peers (whole group) confidently and productively but Justin was still isolated when it came to interaction. At this time another student "Matt" was brought into the small playgroup. This was where the old anti-social behaviors started to show up in Justin. He would want to interact with the other two boys but they seemed to exclude him in all areas. With this he became physical and found that the only way he could enter in their play was by causing havoc. It was apparent that Matt wasn't the strong social model needed.

After discussion we decided what was needed were better role models. Children were needed that could and would interact in positive social ways and possessing the social skills vital to a healthy relationship. With this we brought in two children that have these skills and also show high ratings on the first sociogram (Ellis). What we witnessed was that the skills and behaviors introduced to Justin were being used naturally by our new play partners. When asked if they could join in his play he was helpful and courteous. He was willing to help find the articles they needed (lego wheels), also the visiting going on during this time was positive and productive. The children were working parallel in their projects but cooperation was apparent with each other needs.

Sociogram:

Ellis's sociogram was used to better understand where Justin stood socially in the classroom. The question asked;" If you could play with anyone in the class, who would you play with?" showed us that Justin was having troubles when it came to interacting with peers in a play situation. The first reading showed him to be an isolate, which meant that no one had chosen him as someone to play with. The sociogram helped us understand the peer network and relationships in the classroom and gave us information on how we could help Justin when it came to choosing skilled models (Appendix A-2).

The second sociogram helped show that Justin was beginning to carry some of the skills modeled during playgroup over into classroom peer interaction. In the second sociogram Justin was chosen by one of his peers as a person they would play with (Appendix B-2). This helped show that the positive interaction skills Justin is beginning to use are helping him become an active participate in the classroom.

Video:
Two videos were taken during this time. The main purpose of these videos is to use them as an assessment tool to see what was going on during playgroup time. During the taping time appropriate behaviors were not modeled by adults, the main purpose was to see what would happen and to show Justin and his peers what was going on during playtime.

When the tapes were shown back to the playgroup we emphasized positive social behaviors. The students were interested in watching what they were doing. By giving little cues to Justin such as, "Justin did you see how you made Cody happy when you shared your Legos," and "It was nice of you to thank Carly when she gave you the puzzle piece," were ways of reinforcing the positive skills for interacting

Strategies Taught:
The main purpose was to see if we could help Justin become successful in social interaction with his peers during play. He benefited through the modeling of appropriate behaviors such as sharing, initiating positive conversations, and helping others. We felt our main goal was to help Justin develop his own methods to interact comfortably with his peers and feel positive about himself.

Summary
Justin is starting to show positive signs when it comes to interacting with his peers and adults. He is entering play in positive ways, and using positive statements such as: "it's your turn", "may I please help you", "thank you for the car", "would you like this lego", are the first steps to building the social skills needed to enter play and be socially accepted. The process is slow but with continued reinforcement of modeling he is building strategies that hopefully will follow him through life.

This research is still in the beginning stages. Questions keep coming up as I summarize the project, they are: Can two months of modeling change behaviors that have been five years in the making? How can we feel that two months worth of data is enough to draw concrete conclusions? Do we really feel that the changes were seeing will continue without modeling? All are valid questions, which means that the research must continue. We realize the findings will change, hopefully to a positive note stating that "building a relationship with a child in a small group setting will influence his/her social interaction with peers and adults."

Subject #3 Brady

Personal Background: Brady is a 5-year-old kindergartner in my class of 16 students. He is the second child in a family of six. He lives with his mom and step-dad, an older brother in 2nd grade and a younger sister in preschool. He also has a newborn sister. His parents divorced when Brady was just a couple years old. Mom says that Brady very rarely sees his real dad, perhaps only on his birthday. He believes that his step-dad is his real dad and that his real dad is only his older brother's dad. Brady's step-father works seasonally as a construction worker and mom says that the family has difficulty making ends meet financially. However, they are not on any welfare program at this time.

Brady is of Kenaitze Indian descent. The Kenaitze are natives of the Kenai Peninsula. His paternal grandfather is the priest of the local Russian Orthodox Church.

Brady attended a head start program for about a half a year. His teacher said that he displayed defiant and aggressive behavior. She put him on a behavior system where he could earn stars for compliant and non-aggressive behavior. He interacted with many of his peers at the school and seemed to be "popular". He was the oldest child at the Headstart when he attended.

According to mom and the preschool teacher, Brady's parents use time-out frequently as a punishment for negative behavior. Brady is sent to his room for long periods of time but he often escapes through the window and goes outside to his fort or to play with friends next door.

History of behavior: I immediately became very frustrated with his behavior from the first day of school. Brady revealed aggressive behavior by stepping hard on another boy's foot making him cry. In this incident and several incidents to follow, I tried to respond constructively to his aggressive ways but he was not responding and I became very tempted to use authoritative techniques such as rewards and punishments. His peers were already beginning to complain to me constantly about his behavior and several even expressed to him that they didn't want to play with him because he was mean or hurt people. It was at this point that I decided to involve Brady in this project because I truly believed that building a relationship with me would help him develop the social skills needed to interact with others in a positive way.

Data Analysis:

Early Journal entries-The First Weeks: I kept journal entries on Brady for 14 weeks. Early entries before the playgroup began revealed an increasing number of aggressive/defiant behaviors. He would either not respond to my requests or give me an emphatic "no!" He never looked me in the eye when he talked with me. By the 4th week he had poked a child near the eye with the pencil. I sent him home not only because of our school violence policy but I explained to him and his mom that I could not trust him to keep others safe and felt he needed some time at home to get himself

together. During these first weeks he became increasingly aggressive and defiant, not responding to my directions and calling attention to himself during group time by hiding out and/or throwing things in the group and distracting many of the children. I could tell that he had a great need to get attention and was seeking it out in negative ways. Because I was starting to sound more demanding in my requests and beginning to use manipulation techniques to get him to do what I wanted, I knew that I needed to do something fast to help not only him but myself! I knew that behaviorist techniques were not conducive to building relationships and could in fact damage any existing relationship we may have been beginning to build. In fact, I was quickly beginning to consciously not like him and not wanting to interact with him and that really scared me!

Playgroup : Soon after Brady's severe aggressive behavior with the pencil, I started inviting him to stay after school one day a week for an hour. Brady and I played alone together for the first several weeks making things out of wood, playing on the computer and playing games. One week we even went to his home and he took great pleasure in showing me around his home and doing some things that he liked to do. Most often I took his lead on what he would like to do but sometimes I'd ask him to do something with me only when I was sure he would want to do it. I noticed that he had great skills for cooperating and taking turns. He talked with me respectfully in a friendly conversational tone, much different from the tough, defiant voice he used in the classroom. Those first few play sessions were wonderful because he appeared to be a different child. He displayed none of the aggressive/defiant behaviors that I noticed in the classroom setting and just as importantly, I was really beginning to like him and looking forward to our time together each week. Whether or not he was building a relationship with me at this point didn't seem to matter as much as the positive feelings I was experiencing towards him!

After several weeks (week 10) I begin adding a peer to the playgroup. I was pleased with the progress the two of us had been making but noticed that Brady was still not interacting positively with peers. One of the other subjects of this study, Justin and my colleague Mrs. Lyons who is working with him, joined forces and we played games together. Brady exhibited the same positive skills that he had when he and I just interacted. Mrs. Lyons and I continually modeled appropriate strategies for playing games such as taking turns, following the rules and keeping the game going. It was at this point that I was beginning to feel like we were really getting somewhere with Brady because I wrote, "I think there's really hope for this little guy."

Some weeks there were just one peer and on other weeks a different child would join the group. Sometimes I asked Brady who he wanted to play with and other times I picked a peer that I felt would be a strong model for him. I was continually surprised at the positive social skills he was using. To enter play he would ask, "Can I help you?" When a peer's block structure got accidentally knocked down, he would offer to help put it back together.

Classroom Behavior: After the playgroup sessions began at the end of the 4^{rth} week, there have been only 2 severe acts of aggression towards someone and several minor incidents as well. The severe aggression occurred only in the next couple of weeks after the playgroup began. However, I noticed an increase in destructive behavior on

objects such as putting a crayon in the pencil sharpener, putting holes in his journal and scribbling profusely on someone else's picture. At the end of week 6, he began to join the group more frequently but still chose not to come many times. By week 8 Brady seemed to by lying a lot and becoming the scapegoat for everything that is going wrong in the classroom.

I also noticed some really positive changes occurring. As the weeks after playgroup passed, he seemed to become more polite saying please and thank you. During week 9 a peer fell on the ice outside the classroom and he asked, "Are you all right?" The complaining from classmates became minimal and although they were not responding to him enthusiastically, there seemed to be more of a neutral atmosphere existing between him and his peers.

It took several weeks of playgroup sessions before Brady began to really listen to what I had to say and respond to me in the classroom. At this point in time, I feel comfortable asking Brady to do something and feel almost certain that he will comply with my wishes as long as I make it clear not only what my expectations are but how his actions will benefit himself and the rest of the class. He responds to this very well!

Video: Two playgroup sessions were videotaped during weeks 13 & 14. The main purpose of these videos was to assess what strategies Brady had or didn't have when interacting with peers, to know how to help him further and to have Brady analyze his social behaviors for himself. During the first taping Brady displayed positive social skills with one peer but both he and his playmate excluded the third person, Justin, from their play at times. Matt would move to another activity calling Brady over and leaving Justin behind. However, Brady and Matt interacted very positively together. Mrs. Lyons and I analyzed the tape and saw the great skills Brady was using. He was taking turns when playing Bingo with Matt and offered to help rebuild Matt's Tinkertoy structure that Justin had purposely wrecked. We decided to take another video next week but show it to the group and give feedback.

The next week we decided to invite 2 strong models to play with Brady and Justin. We felt only 3 kids playing together can lead to exclusion unless we are playing with the group as the 4th person. Brady had a hard time entering the play of the 3 peers who were playing with Legos. He used a typical rejected child strategy by drawing attention to himself such as hitting someone's structure and talking about himself and his needs. He kept hitting other children's structures. We showed the video to the whole group and pointed out positive behaviors as well as negative ones. Brady was very apprehensive to look at himself engaging in the negative behavior and he would say, "I didn't do it" and when asked why he did he would reply, "I don't know". He complained of having a headache towards the end of the day so it is uncertain whether or not this contributed to his behavior.

Sociogram: The pre- and post sociograms showed little change. Each time only 1 and the same person chose Brady. The only difference was that this person picked Brady for his first choice during the post-sociogram (2 points scored) and his 2nd choice during administration of the 1st (3 points scored total). The child that Brady had been interacting very positively with in several playgroup sessions and in the classroom

was not there for the post-sociogram. It is my assumption that Brady might have received more points if this child was there. However, the results show, according to the point system used, that Brady still shows signs of being a rejected child.

Summary

From the data analysis, I can enthusiastically say that Brady and I have developed a very positive relationship both in the playgroup and in the classroom. Although the sociogram revealed that he is in the low-range for peer relationships and is still classified as a rejected child, he is showing positive signs of being part of the classroom community. He is joining the group more often without prompting during group times on the rug and using very minimal aggression when conflict occurs.

There are still many behaviors that disturb me and may be preventing him from interacting positively with his peers such as his denial of being responsible for a problem that comes up and his sometimes-destructive behavior. It is uncertain at this time if these behaviors can be minimized by his participation in the playgroup. However, to continue building relationships with his peers and with myself, it is my intention to continue the playgroup for the remainder of the school year. I am anxious to see how his social behaviors might progress and to see if there is any effect on the previous behaviors mentioned. It will be interesting to examine the results of an end-of-year sociogram to see if there are changes in the way his peers view him.

Results

With all our subjects we saw that each child acted differently in the playgroup setting than they did in the classroom. They worked cooperatively, they used positive communication skills and they entered play more appropriately. Perhaps these behaviors occurred because the playgroup provided an opportunity for these children to interact with only one or two other people. This may be a more appropriate group-size for anti-social children.

The most valuable finding was that two out of the three subjects exhibited more cooperative behavior with their teachers during the regular school day. They were less defiant, more willing to join the group on their own when the teacher invited them and able to communicate more appropriately. We also noticed changes in our attitudes as we interacted with our subjects in the classroom. We were better able to confront them when a problem arose whereas prior to the playgroup we tried to avoid conflict with them for fear of creating a power-struggle. We tended to use more authoritarian methods of discipline to get these students to comply with our requests. Because of this newly established relationship with our subjects, there were, in general, fewer incidents of conflict and more of an authoritative or constructivist approach taken in solving conflicts.

Concluding Remarks

Overall, we feel that that the small playgroup setting is valuable in helping children build relationships with others. When we work one-on-one with our subjects, we can focus our attention on skills they have and need. Without constant distractions we are able to get to know the children on a more personal level and model prosocial skills such as entering play, positive communication and cooperating with others. We feel that we have enough positive evidence to justify the time and effort that it takes to begin a playgroup for rejected, aggressive or controversial children. We recommend this approach for other teachers who are experiencing similar problems with students in their classroom.

Because of our successes to date, we will continue the playgroup so that these students will continue to build more positive relationships not only with us but with their peers as well. We still see the importance of our modeling through co-play and will provide continued opportunities for our interaction on a one-to-one basis as well as in a small group of the subjects' peers. We will continue to monitor the subjects' successes within the regular classroom setting and hopefully see more progress as time goes on.

Some of the questions we still have include; What would be the effects on the subjects if the playgroup was offered two or three times per week? How can we better facilitate the transfer of newly developing social skills to the classroom setting? How will a promotion to a 1st grade authoritarian classroom affect the progress that our subjects have made this year? Further research on the playgroup structure will have to be done to answer these questions.

Professional Readings:

Brophy, J. (1996). Enhancing students' socialization: Key elements. *Eric Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education*, EDO-PS-96-6.

Bullock, J. Children without friends. (1992). *Childhood Education*, 69(2); 92-96.

Buzzelli, C. & File, N. (1989). Building trust in friends. *Young Children*, 44(2); 70-74.

Choi, H. & Heckenlaible-Gotto, M. (1997). Classroom-based social skills training: Impact on peer acceptance of first-grade students. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 91(2), 209-214.

Coie, J. (1990). Toward a theory of peer rejection. In S. Asher & J. Coie (Eds.), *Peer rejection in childhood* (pp. 365-401). New York: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

DeVries R. & Zan, B. (1994). *Moral classrooms, moral children: Creating a constructivist atmosphere in early education*. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Eisenberg, N & Mussen, P. (1989). *The roots of prosocial behavior in children*. New York: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

Ferrintio, M. (1990). Increasing social competence in kindergarten and first grade children through modeling and practice in a self-motivating play group. *Eric Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education*, ED-325-247.

Fields M. & Boesser, C. (1998). *Constructive guidance and discipline: Preschool and primary education (second edition)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Greenberg, P. (1992). Ideas that work with young children: How to institute some simple democratic practices pertaining to respect, rights, roots, and responsibilities in any classroom. *Young Children*,47(5); 10-17.

Hartup, W. (1992). Having friends, Making friends, and keeping friends: relationships as educational contexts. *Eric Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education;* EDO-PS-92-4

Hazen, N. & et al. (1982). Social exceptance: How children achieve it and how teachers can help. *Eric Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education*, ED-241-139.

Hubbard, R. & Power, B. (1993). *The art of classroom inquiry: A handbook for teacher-researchers*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Jewett, J. (1992). Aggresion and cooperation: Helping young children develop constructive strategies. *Eric Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education*, EDO-PS-92-10.

Katz, L. & McClellan, D. (19997). *Fostering children's social competence: The teacher's role*. Washington, D.C: National Association for the education of young children.

Kemple, K. (1991). Preschool children's peer acceptance and social interaction. *Young Children*, 46(5); 47-54.

Kemple, K. (1992). Understanding and facilitating preschool children's peer acceptance. Eric Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early *Childhood Education*, EDO-PS-92-5.

McClellan, D. (1989). Social skills training intervention with aggressive young children. *Eric Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education*, ED-312-035.

Miller, C. (1984). Building self control: Discipline for young children. *Young Children*. 39(6); 15-19.

Oden, S. & Asher, S. (1977). Coaching children in social skills for friendship making. *Child Development*, 48(2); 495-506.

Pellegrini, A. & Glickman, C. (1990). Measuring kindergartners' social competence. *Young Children*, 45(4); 40-44.

Putallez, M. & Gottman, J. (1981). An interactional model of children's entry into peer groups. *Child Development*, 52(3); 986-994.

Ramsey, P. (1991). *Making friends in school: Promoting peer relationships in early childhood*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Scarlett, W. (1986). Co-Playing: Teachers as models for friendship. In D. Wolf (Ed.), *Connecting: Friendship in the lives of young children and their teachers* (pp. 87-93). Redmond, WA: Exchange Press Inc.

Stimson, E. (1988). Don't just say no to a child wanting attenition when you're busy. *Young Children*,43(5); 30-31.

Warren, S. (1976). The truth about children's lies. *Day Care and Early Education*, 4(2); 16-18.

	Names	Paul	Gar C.	Nanette	Sean	Billy Je	Cody	Gar F.	Tyler	Anna	Matt	Demari	Brittan	Sam S.	Chris	Trevor	Erin	Allan	Sam W.
1	Paul				3	2	1	2	1			3					absent		3
2	Garrett C							3	2						2				
3	Nanette																		
4	Sean	3							3			1						2	2
5	Billy Je						2							2	1				
6	Cody			3	1	3					2					3		1	
7	Garrett F		3												3				
8	Tyler									2									
9	Anna												1					3	
10	Matt			2			3	1								2			
11	Demaris	2	2										2						
12	Brittany		1									2		3					1
13	Sam S.									1									
14	Chris	1		1	2	1								1					
15	Trevor										1								
16	Erin																		
17	Allan									3	3					1			
18	Sam W.												3						
19																			

Ellis's Sociogram **October 19,1998**

Question: If you could play with anyone in our class who would you play with?

Isolate=Chosen by no classmates
Low-range=Chosen by 1-2 classmates
Mid-range=Chosen 3-5 classmates
Stars=Chosen by 6-7 classmates

First number in parentheses denotes point total for first, second, and third selections. Second number in parentheses denotes the number of classmates who chose this individual.

Stars	Mid-range	Low-range	Isolate
Paul (15,7)	Sean (11,5)	Garrett F. (6,2)	Nanette (0)
Cody (13,6)	Garrett C. (7,3)	Anna (4,2)	
	Billy Jean (5,3)	SamW (3,1)	
	Matt (8,4)	SamS. (1,1)	
	Demaris (6,3)	Trevor (1,1)	
	Brittany (7,4)	Tyler (2,1)	
	Chris (6,5)		
	Allan (7,3)		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Ellis's Sociogram

QUESTION: If you could play with anyone in our class who would you play with?

Isolate=Chosen by no classmates

Low-range=Chosen by 1-2 classmates

Mid-range=Chosen by 3-5 classmates

Stars-Chosen by 6-7 classmates

October 16, 1998

First number in parentheses denotes point total for first, second, and third selections. Second number in parentheses denotes the number of classmates who chose this individual.

Stars	Mid-range	Low-range	Isolate
Cody W. (20,8)	Matt (5,3)Michelle(9,3)	Logan (5,2))	Justin (0)
	Spencer(8,4)Amy (3,3)	Halli (4,2)	
	Aleah(6,3)Carly(4,3)	Johnney(1, 1)	
	Jordon(8,3)	Leah (1,1)	
		Brady (2,1)	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
1	NAMES	Justin B	Logan	Matt	Amy F.	Leah G.	Halli H.	Jordon J	Carly L.	Aleah N.	Michelle	Brady	Cody V.	Cody W.	Spencer	Johnney
2													absent			
3	Justin B.															
4	Logan	2													3	
5	Matt					1						3			1	
6	Amy F.		1						1		1					
7	Leah G.													1		
8	Halli H.					3		1								
9	Jordon J.		3	2										3		
10	Carly L.			1			2				3					1
11	Aleah N.				2									2		2
12	Michelle						3		3							
13	Brady														2	
14	Cody V.															
15	Cody W.		2	3	3			3	2		2	2				3
16	Spencer	3			1	2		2								
17	Johnney						1									

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Names	Paul	Gar C.	Nanette	Sean	Billy Je	Cody	Gar F.	Tyler	Anna	Matt	Demari	Brittan	Sam S.	Chris	Trevor	Erin	Allan	Sam W.	Brett
1	Paul				2				Absent		1			2			2			
2	GarrettC							3												
3	Nanette							2									3			
4	Sean	3												3	1	1				
5	Billy Je			2																
6	Cody			1	3			1			3				3	3				
7	GarrettF		3																	
8	Tyler									3									1	
9	Anna																	3		
10	Matt						3									2				3
11	Demaris			3		2														
12	Brittany											2		1	2					
13	Sam S.		2			1				1			3					1	3	
14	Chris	2			1	3							2						2	
15	Trevor						2					3								
16	Erin		1				1													
17	Allan	1								2	2						1	2		
18	Sam W.											1	1							
19	Brett																			
20																				

Ellis's Sociogram **November 25,1998**

Question: If you could play with anyone in our class who would you play with?

Isolate=Chosen by no classmates
Low-range=Chosen by 1-2 classmates
Mid-range=Chosen by 3-5 classmates
Stars=Chosen by 6-7 classmates

First number in parentheses denotes point total for first, second, and third selections. Second number in parentheses denotes the number of classmates who chose this individual.

Stars	Mid-range	Low-range	Isolate
Sam S. (11,6)	Paul (7,4)	Garrett C. (3,1)	Brett (0,0)
Cody (14,6)	Sean (8,4)	Nanette (5,2)	
	Matt (8,3)	Billy Jean (2,1)	
	Brittany (5,3)	Garrett F. (3,1)	
	Chris (10,5)	Tyler (4,2)	
	Allan (6,4)	Anna (3,1)	
	Sam. W. (4,3)	Demaris (5,2)	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R
1	NAMES	Justin B.	Logan	Matt	Amy F.	Leah G.	Haili H.	Jordon I.	Carly L.	Aleah N.	Michelle	Brady	Cody V.	Cody W.	Spencer	Johnney	Sharika	Shane
2				Absent														Absent
3	Justin B.		2															
4	Logan	3																
5	Matt		1							2		3			1			
6	Amy F.																	
7	Leah G.		3														3	
8	Haili H.				1	3					2			2				
9	Jordon I.								2		1		1	1				
10	Carly L.						2				3					3	1	
11	Aleah N.																	
12	Michelle						3		3							2		
13	Brady														3			
14	Cody V.							2						3			2	
15	Cody W.				2		1	3	1			1						
16	Spencer							1		3		2						
17	Johnney																	
18	Sharika	2			3					1			3		2	1		
19	Shane	1											2					

Ellis's Sociogram **November 25,1998**

Question: If you could play with anyone in our class who would you play with?

Isolate=Chosen by no classmates
Low-range=Chosen by 1-2 classmates
Mid-range=Chosen by 3-5 classmates
Stars=Chosen by 6-7 classmates

First number in parentheses denotes point total for first, second, and third selections. Second number in parentheses denotes the number of classmates who chose this individual.

Stars	Mid-range	Low-range	Isolate
Sharika (12,6)	Matt (7,4)	Justin (2,1)	Amy F. (0,0)
	Haili H. (8,4)	Logan (3,1)	Johnney (0,0)
	Jordon (5,4)	Leah G. (6,2)	Aleah N. (0,0)
	Carly (9,4)	Brady (3,1)	
	Michelle (8,3)	Shane (3,2)	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE